

REMARKS

Claims 109 and 113-213 are pending in the application. Claims 115-117 have been amended. The title of the application has been amended to reflect the subject matter of the pending claims. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at, e.g., page 7, lines 25-30. These amendments add no new matter.

Allowable Subject Matter

At page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 109, 113, 114, 121-148, and 152-213 appear to be allowable. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgement of allowable subject matter. In view of the amendments and remarks presented herein, applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Title of Application

At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner requested that the title be amended to clearly indicate the invention to which the claims are directed. The title has been amended as follows so as to reflect the scope of all of the pending claims: "METHODS OF TREATING AN INFLAMMATORY DISORDER AND INHIBITING PROLIFERATION, CYTOKINE PRODUCTION, AND SIGNAL TRANSDUCTION WITH AN ANTIBODY AGAINST COSTIMULATORY SIGNAL TRANSDUCTION MOLECULE AILIM."

35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph (Indefiniteness)

At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 118-120 and 149-151 as allegedly "indefinite in the recitation of 'a V region DNA encoding a heavy (or light) chain variable region,' because the recitation lacks antecedent basis in the respective base claims 109 and 115."

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection in view of the following comments. Claims 118-120 and 149-151 further limit claims 109 and 115 by requiring that one of element (a), (b), or (c), which are recited in the alternative in claims 109 and 115, be present in each of

the six dependent claims. Each of claims 118-120 and 149-151 requires the presence of an element listed in an independent claim, but does not further limit that element. It is for this reason that elements (a), (b), and (c) are repeated verbatim in dependent claims 118-120 and 149-151.

Applicants discussed this rejection in a telephone conference with the Examiner on May 18, 2006. The Examiner agreed that the rejection will be withdrawn in view of the foregoing remarks. As a result, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph (Enablement)

At pages 4-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 115-117 as allegedly not enabled. According to the Examiner, the specification, while being enabling for a method of inhibiting production of interferon gamma or interleukin 4, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of inhibiting production of a generically recited "cytokine."

Claims 115-117 have been amended to recite a method of inhibiting production of "interferon gamma or interleukin 4" (instead of inhibiting production of a "cytokine"). In view of these amendments, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

CONCLUSIONS

Applicants submit that all grounds for rejection have been overcome, and that all claims are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly requested.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 14539-006002.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

July 17, 2006

Jack Brennan
Reg. No. 47,443

Fish & Richardson P.C.
Citigroup Center
52nd Floor
153 East 53rd Street
New York, New York 10022-4611
Telephone: (212) 765-5070
Facsimile: (212) 258-2291